

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44*bis*)

Applicant's or agent's file reference IGT053C1X1WO	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/US2007/015015	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 27 June 2007 (27.06.2007)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 05 July 2006 (05.07.2006)
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant IGT		

1.	This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 <i>bis</i> .1(a).																								
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of 9 sheets, including this cover sheet. In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.																								
3.	<p>This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 30%;">Box No. I</td> <td style="width: 60%;">Basis of the report</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. II</td> <td>Priority</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. III</td> <td>Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. IV</td> <td>Lack of unity of invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. V</td> <td>Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VI</td> <td>Certain documents cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VII</td> <td>Certain defects in the international application</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VIII</td> <td>Certain observations on the international application</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																							
4.	The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44 <i>bis</i> .3(c) and 93 <i>bis</i> .1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44 <i>bis</i> .2).																								

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Date of issuance of this report 06 January 2009 (06.01.2009)
Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70	Authorized officer <div style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">Beate Giffo-Schmitt</div> e-mail: pt03.pct@wipo.int

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/US2007/015015

International filing date (day/month/year)
27.06.2007

Priority date (day/month/year)
05.07.2006

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
INV. G07F17/32

Applicant
IGT

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Date of completion of
this opinion

see form
PCT/ISA/210

Authorized Officer

Kling, Jonas

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-6045



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US2007/015015

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - ☒ the international application in the language in which it was filed
 - ☐ a translation of the international application into , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1 (b)).
2. ☐ This opinion has been established taking into account the **rectification of an obvious mistake** authorized by or notified to this Authority under Rule 91 (Rule 43bis.1(a))
3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ on paper
 - ☐ in electronic form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
4. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
5. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US2007/015015

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	<u>1-14,16-18,20-30,32-39,43-46</u>
	No: Claims	<u>15,19,31,40-42</u>
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	<u>1-46</u>
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	<u>1-46</u>
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

Re Item V

**Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: US-A-5 967 895
D2: US-A-2004/077402
D3: US-A-2005/233799

2 Novelty

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of independent claims 15, 31 and 40 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

2.1 Independent claim 15

The document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

A method of displaying multiple bingo cards (cf. c.3 l.1-3), the method comprising: determining when a player will use B bingo cards in a bingo game, where B is a number greater than a predetermined number N of bingo cards that can simultaneously be displayed in a first area of a first display device (cf. fig.1; in this case is N=4); selecting automatically N of the B bingo cards to be displayed in the first area; and displaying N automatically selected bingo cards in the first area (cf. c.3 l.26-31).

Therefore the subject-matter of independent claim 15 does not satisfy the criterion set forth in Article 33(2) PCT regarding novelty.

2.2 The same argumentation (see point 2.1 above) also applies to independent claim 31.

2.3 Independent claim 40

The document D3 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

A gaming method comprising (cf. abstract): receiving an input signal to initiate a game on a gaming machine; rendering one or more two-dimensional projection surfaces derived from a three-dimensional position of the projection surface in a three-dimensional gaming environment; and displaying the two-dimensional projection surfaces on a display screen of the gaming machine (cf. fig.1; fig.8, fig.9).

Therefore the subject-matter of independent claim 40 does not satisfy the criterion set forth in Article 33(2) PCT regarding novelty.

3 Inventive step

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1 and 43 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

3.1 Independent claim 1

The document D2 is regarded as being the closest prior art to the subject-matter of claim 1, and discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

A gaming machine (cf. fig.2; abstract), comprising:
a network interface (cf. fig.1; [0045]);
at least one user input device (cf. fig.17; [0061]; [0115]);
a first display device (cf. fig.3(70); fig.17; [0114]); and
at least one logic device (cf. fig.3(104)) configured to do the following:
determine, based at least in part on input received from the user input device,

when a player will use B bingo cards in a bingo game (cf. [0117]); control the first display device to display N selected bingo cards in the first area; and provide a bingo game according to bingo game information received via the network interface (cf. [0117-0118]).

The subject-matter of claim 1 therefore differs from this known gaming machine in that the logic device is further configured to:

- (i) when B is a number greater than a predetermined number N of bingo cards that can simultaneously be displayed in a first area of the first display device then select N of the B bingo cards to be displayed in the first area

Feature (i) provides the effect that a player can play more bingo cards than can be displayed on the display. Document D2 does not explicitly disclose feature (i) but it can be understood that the player may play more than one bingo card (cf. [0117]) and can also select between bingo cards (cf. fig.17(612); [0115]).

The problem to be solved by the present invention may therefore be regarded as

(p1) how to display a bingo game where a player plays a plurality of bingo cards

The solution proposed in claim 1 of the present application cannot be considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) for the following reasons.

It is well known in the art that a player may wish to play a plurality of bingo cards on a gaming machine (for example indicated in D2, [0117]). Document D2 does not explicitly mention how a plurality of bingo cards would be displayed, however, the feature (i) has already been employed for the same purpose in a similar gaming machine, see document D1, column 3, lines 1-31. It would be obvious to the person skilled in the art, namely when the same result is to be achieved, to apply the feature with corresponding effect to a gaming machine according to document D2 thereby arriving at a gaming machine according to claim 1.

Therefore the subject-matter of independent claim 1 does not satisfy the criterion set

forth in Article 33(3) PCT regarding inventive step.

3.2 Independent claim 43

The subject-matter of claim 43 relates to presentation of multiple bingo cards on surfaces of a virtual three-dimensional object (cf. abstract; fig.8; fig.9). Document D3 discloses a three-dimensional gaming environment. Using document D3 as a starting point the person skilled in the art confronted with the problem (p1) above would, with the same argumentation as above (see point 3.1) derive the subject-matter of claim 43 without using any inventive skills. Therefore the subject-matter of independent claim 43 does not satisfy the criterion set forth in Article 33(3) PCT regarding inventive step.

- 4 Dependent claims 2-14, 16-30, 32-39, 41, 42 and 44-46 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty or inventive step.

Re Item VIII

Certain observations on the international application

- 5 It is drawn to the applicants attention that the subject-matter of claims 15-46 rather relates to the mere presentation of bingo cards. Such subject-matter is not required to be searched by the International Searching Authority, Rule 39.1(v) PCT.
- 6 Although claims 1, 15, 31, 40 and 43 have been drafted as separate independent claims, they appear to relate effectively to the same subject-matter and to differ from each other only with regard to the definition of the subject-matter for which protection is sought or in respect of the terminology used for the features of that subject-matter. The aforementioned claims therefore lack conciseness and as such do not meet the

requirements of Article 6 PCT.

Independent claim 1 is not in the two-part form in accordance with Rule 6.3(b) PCT, which in the present case would be appropriate, with those features known in combination from the prior art (document D2) being placed in the preamble (Rule 6.3(b)(I) PCT) and with the remaining features being included in the characterising part (Rule 6.3(b)(ii) PCT).

The features of the claims are not provided with reference signs placed in parentheses (Rule 6.2(b) PCT).

Contrary to the requirements of Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT, the relevant background art disclosed in the documents D1, D2 and D3 is not mentioned in the description, nor are these documents identified therein.